# U.S. Department of Education

# 2015 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

| [X] Pul  | blic or [] No | on-public           |                       |                    |
|--|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X   | [] Title I    | [] Charter          | [] Magnet             | [] Choice          |
| Name of Principal Mrs. Carey Crocker   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr  |               | (As it should a     | ppear in the official | records)           |
| Official School Name Eastover Elementary Scho  |               | EC: .: .1           |                       |                    |
| (As it should app  | ear in the oi | iliciai records)    |                       |                    |
| School Mailing Address 1101 Westview Road  |               |                     |                       |                    |
| (If address is P.O   | ). Box, also  | include street ac   | ldress.)              |                    |
| City Bloomfield Hills State M  | ΛI            | Zip Coo             | de+4 (9 digits tota   | 1) 48304-2071      |
|  |               | _                   |                       |                    |
| County Oakland County  | Sta           | te School Cod       | e Number* <u>0507</u> | 6                  |
| Telephone <u>248-341-7100</u>  | Fax           | x <u>248-341-71</u> | 99                    |                    |
| Web site/URL   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| http://www.bloomfield.org/eas  |               | nail ccrocker       | @bloomfield.org       |                    |
|  | <b>D</b> 1    | nun <u>ceroeker</u> | e biodimicia.org      |                    |
| Twitter Handle   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| <u>@careycrocker,</u><br>@BHSorchestra,  |               |                     |                       |                    |
| <u>@BHSElemBand</u> Facebook Page  |               | Google+             |                       |                    |
|  |               | Other So            | ocial Media Link      |                    |
| YouTube/URL Blog   |               | http://wv           | ww.eastoverpto.or     | <u>g/</u>          |
| I have reviewed the information in this applicat<br>Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is acc |               | ing the eligibi     | lity requirements     | on page 2 (Part I- |
| (D.:: 22 C:  |               | Date                |                       |                    |
| (Principal's Signature)  |               |                     |                       |                    |
| Name of Superintendent*Dr. Rob Glass   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| (Specify: Ms., Miss, N   | Mrs., Dr., N  | Mr., E-m            | ail: rglass@bloom     | ifield.org         |
| Other)   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| District Name Bloomfield Hills Public Schools  |               | Геl. 248-34         | 1-6305                |                    |
| I have reviewed the information in this applicat   | tion, includ  | ing the eligibi     | lity requirements     | on page 2 (Part I- |
| Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is acc   | curate.       |                     |                       |                    |
|  | D             | ate                 |                       |                    |
| (Superintendent's Signature)   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| Name of School Board   |               |                     |                       |                    |
| President/Chairperson Mrs. Ingrid Day  |               |                     |                       |                    |
| (Specify: Ms., N   | Miss, Mrs.,   | Dr., Mr., Oth       | er)                   |                    |
| I have reviewed the information in this applicat<br>Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is acc |               | ing the eligibi     | lity requirements     | on page 2 (Part I- |
|  |               | Date                |                       |                    |
| (School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature  | ure)          |                     |                       |                    |

\*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 1 of 25

#### PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

#### Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below, concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are true and correct.

- 1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2014-2015 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2009 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
- 7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
- 8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 2 of 25

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

## All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

| Number of schools in the district (per district designation): | 4 Elementary schools (includes K-8) 3 Middle/Junior high schools |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | Tigh schools   |  |  |
|   | 0 K-12 schools   |  |  |

<u>10</u> TOTAL

## **SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

| 2. | Category  | that | best | describes   | the area | where  | the | school | is | located: |
|----|-----------|------|------|-------------|----------|--------|-----|--------|----|----------|
|    | Cuto Sor, | unc  | CCSt | accertices. | uic aica | ****** | uic | SCHOOL | 10 | rocurea. |

| [] Urban or large central city                            |
|---|
| [] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area |
| [X] Suburban  |
| [] Small city or town in a rural area                     |
| [] Rural  |

- 3.  $\underline{1}$  Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
- 4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade             | # of  | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------------|
|                   | Males |              |             |
| PreK              | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| K                 | 51    | 55           | 106         |
| 1                 | 47    | 44           | 91          |
| 2                 | 44    | 49           | 93          |
| 3                 | 50    | 56           | 106         |
| 4                 | 43    | 42           | 85          |
| 5                 | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 6                 | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 7                 | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 8                 | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 9                 | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 10                | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 11                | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| 12                | 0     | 0            | 0           |
| Total<br>Students | 235   | 246          | 481         |

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 3 of 25

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

1 % American Indian or Alaska Native

10 % Asian

14 % Black or African American

6 % Hispanic or Latino

1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

67 % White

1 % Two or more races

100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2013 - 2014 year: 11%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate                | Answer |
|--|--------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i>   |        |
| the school after October 1, 2013 until the         | 18     |
| end of the school year                             |        |
| (2) Number of students who transferred             |        |
| <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until | 36     |
| the end of the school year                         |        |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of      | 54     |
| rows (1) and (2)]                                  | 34     |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as      | 477    |
| of October 1                                       | 4//    |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3)          | 0.112  |
| divided by total students in row (4)               | 0.113  |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100            | 11     |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school:

10 %

47 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented:

15

Specify non-English languages: <u>Arabic, Spanish, Urdu, Romanian, Wolof, Chaldean, Hindi, Vietnamese, Ukranian, Bosnian, Italian, Mandarin, Russian, Telugu, Tagalog</u>

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:

13 %

Total number students who qualify:

64

### Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that <u>41</u>% of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 4 of 25

9. Students receiving special education services: 24 %

116 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

8 Autism2 Orthopedic Impairment0 Deafness8 Other Health Impaired0 Deaf-Blindness12 Specific Learning Disability6 Emotional Disturbance61 Speech or Language Impairment

17 Hearing Impairment 0 Traumatic Brain Injury

<u>0</u> Mental Retardation <u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities <u>1</u> Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

|                                       | Number of Staff |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Administrators                        | 1               |
| Classroom teachers                    | 27              |
| Resource teachers/specialists         |                 |
| e.g., reading, math, science, special | 16              |
| education, enrichment, technology,    | 10              |
| art, music, physical education, etc.  |                 |
| Paraprofessionals                     | 17              |
| Student support personnel             |                 |
| e.g., guidance counselors, behavior   |                 |
| interventionists, mental/physical     |                 |
| health service providers,             | 4               |
| psychologists, family engagement      | 4               |
| liaisons, career/college attainment   |                 |
| coaches, etc.                         |                 |
|                                       |                 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 18:1

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 5 of 25

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information        | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%       | 96%       | 96%       | 96%       | 96%       |
| High school graduation rate | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |

### 13. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

| Post-Secondary Status                         |    |
|---|----|
| Graduating class size                         | 0  |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university    | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college               | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment                              | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service   | 0% |
| Other   | 0% |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award. Yes X No

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award. 1991

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: Our purpose is to educate and inspire the whole child (academically, socially, and emotionally) through a safe, nurturing environment.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 6 of 25

#### PART III – SUMMARY

Eastover Elementary is a very unique school when it comes to the community and the students we serve. We have many traditions, milestones, and a rich history. There are many key strategies we use to encourage and challenge students to develop to their full potential academically, emotionally, physically, socially, and culturally.

Eastover Elementary opened in the Fall of 1956 in the community of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. There were seven teachers and one principal (who was also one of the teachers). By its second year, the student population expanded to 264 children. The building has expanded much since it opened (more classrooms, a new library, improved recreational facilities, and a Fine Arts wing). During its peak, enrollment rose to over 700 students.

In 1986, Eastover welcomed Oakland County's Deaf and Hard of Hearing students into our building. DHH teachers are Highly Qualified in the field of Deafness and work together to advance their students' language development, socialization skills and academic achievement. Each classroom is an environment that supports learning opportunities with individualized student emphasis on differentiation. Teachers follow the general education curriculum by utilizing research based learning strategies such as balanced literacy which includes guided reading, shared reading/writing, independent reading, story signing, guided writing, independent writing and working with word patterns. Technology also helps the teachers and students achieve their goals.

Eastover also educates children with special needs. In the Academic Resource Program (ARP), teachers and paraeducators provide direct instruction to students who are not fully included in the general education setting. Students are full participants in the school environment and are educated in general education classrooms to the extent appropriate.

Social workers, speech and language pathologists, and occupational or physical therapists provide services as determined by the IEP team. Modifications and support are provided in the academic and social environment. Special courses in prevocational, vocational, and personal adjustment skills are often part of the student's program.

At Eastover Elementary, students are taught to think about how humans impact the environment, how to preserve and protect our natural resources, how to ensure adequate resources for a healthy environment, and how to increase efficiency by reducing waste. Students are knowledgeable and inspired to take responsibility for the sustainability of the world.

Eastover has been designated as a Michigan Green School and has earned Evergreen status, which is the highest designation possible. At Eastover, students participate in many "green" practices Another special component of our Sustainability initiative is our student garden. All classrooms spend time in the garden planting and harvesting, while making real-world connections to math, science, and social studies concepts. Students learn about the environmental and health benefits to eating locally grown fresh produce. Eastover is the only Bloomfield Hills school with a mobile demonstration kitchen to provide opportunities for students to cook in the classroom using ingredients from their very own student garden!

Visible Thinking is also used throughout our building. Visible Thinking is not a program; rather, a framework and philosophy for our teachers and staff to use when creating inquiry-based learning opportunities that engage students in higher-level thinking skills.

Our teachers model strategies and share their own thinking right along with their students. Opportunities created in the classroom are intentional and connect to a year-long story of learning.

SOAR/PBIS is a whole school behavior plan. SOAR stands for Self Control, On Task, Acceptance, and Respect. Students are encouraged to display a positive attitude and contribute to our school community in a beneficial way.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 7 of 25

Parents at Eastover are very involved in our school community. One of the many programs they provide is the Eastover Publishing Center. This program encourages all of the students to be authors. Each student writes and illustrates a book. Those books are sent to a publishing center and made into hard cover books. When the books are complete, we have a Young Author's Day and each student is given their published book.

Many student teachers have come from several area universities to complete their student teaching requirements in our building. We are happy to share our teaching knowledge to college students who would like to become elementary and special education teachers.

Third and fourth graders are given the opportunity to be leaders in our building through Eastover Elementary's student council. Student council representatives vote on Spirit Days, have fundraisers, and promote good citizenship.

Eastover Elementary is a neighborhood school. There is a fire station on one side and a full neighborhood all around us. Buses are used to transport students to and from school. Parents can also drop off and pick up their children. Latch Key is provided in the morning and after school for those families who need the extra time.

Eastover Elementary has a very diverse population. Many cultures are represented in our building. Student, teachers, and staff embrace our cultural differences. We all learn that each person is unique and we can learn something new from anyone.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 8 of 25

#### PART IV - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

#### 1. Core Curriculum:

At Eastover Elementary, our core curriculum is aligned with the MAISA (Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators) units developed by Oakland Schools. The units of study were designed for teachers to implement the Common Core Standards in reading, writing, and math that apply to our K-4 elementary school. Science and Social Studies units of study are defined per grade level by the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. A basic grade level framework (curriculum map) is established and then it is the teacher's job to use differentiation to accommodate for each child's learning within their specific K-4 classroom.

Eastover uses the workshop model to implement reading, writing, and math. Through the workshop framework our teachers are able to provide whole group instruction, as well as differentiated instruction, which meets all student needs through individual student conferences and skill-based small group instruction.

In the reading/writing workshop format, instruction is delivered through a whole group mini lesson, followed by independent reading/writing time. During this independent time, the teacher is able to meet with individual students or small groups depending on the skill that needs to be practiced/mastered.

Reader's Workshop is the framework we use to enhance the reading ability of each child. The lessons focus on reading strategies, text connections, decoding practice, fluency, phrasing, and comprehension skills.

Writer's Workshop is the framework we use to enhance the writing ability of each child. These lessons focus on skills related to their specific grade level. These skills include pre-writing, writing, editing, revising, and publishing of personal narratives, informational text, and opinion writing.

Eastover provides specialized instruction in reading with Reading Recovery for first graders, literacy groups for first and second graders, and Title One writing support for small groups of children who are performing below grade level.

Reading Recovery is a short-term reading intervention for first grade students whose reading skills fall within the lowest 5-10% of their classmates. Each student meets individually with a certified Reading Recovery teacher for 30 minutes daily to develop independent reading and writing skills. The goal is for each Reading Recovery student to exit the program after 12-20 weeks of instruction, reading within the average range of their classroom.

Literacy Groups is a reading intervention for first and second grade students whose reading skills are below grade level expectations, but are above the lowest 10% that receive Reading Recovery support. These groups meet four times a week with a Literacy Group specialist. Leveled Literacy Intervention developed by Fountas and Pinnell is used for the intervention for these groups.

Title One writing groups is a writing intervention provided for second and third grade students whose writing skills fall within the lowest 10% of their classmates. These groups meet four times a week with a Title One writing support teacher.

Math Workshop is the framework we use to enhance math skills of each child. The MAISA Units focus on the Common Core Standards for mathematics. The four main units are: operations and algebraic thinking, number and operations in base ten, measurement and data, and geometry. All lessons and activities are meant to strengthen skills in these four areas. In math workshop, instruction begins with a whole group mini lesson, students then work in groups to practice the skill taught. This includes math skill games, math facts practice, teacher lead small group instruction, and independent work.

Title One math groups is a math intervention provided for kindergarten, first, and second grade students

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 9 of 25

whose math skills fall within the lowest 10% of their classmates. These groups meet four times a week with a Title One math support teacher. Enrichment opportunities are provided for students who are performing above grade level expectations.

Our Inquiry based science curriculum follows the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. Each grade level prepares age appropriate lessons related to physical science, life science, and earth science units. As a culminating activity, each class prepares and presents an exhibition that incorporates all curricular areas through a whole language approach. This exhibition is presented to parents by the children and highlights students' learning through visible thinking routines, experiments, and hands-on experiences.

Our Social Studies curriculum follows the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. Each grade level prepares age appropriate lessons related to history, geography, civics and government, economics, and public discourse/citizen involvement. The children learn social studies through technology, research, field trips, and guest speakers. Eastover staff believes in teaching the whole child.

The Resource Room is a program used for students who need extra time to practice and master the skills associated with their grade level. In the Resource Room, children work one-on-one or in small groups.

#### 2. Other Curriculum Areas:

At Eastover Elementary, the children are able to experience art, music, Spanish, physical education, and technology. The children in grades K-4 go to these classes at least once a week. The following is a description of each class as they are related to our students and the curriculum within each program.

Teaching the curriculum of the visual arts is a sequential process. The Elements and Principles of Design, which are the basic building blocks of art, are introduced in kindergarten and reinforced and expanded upon as the student grows older. Students will learn about a number of artists, styles, and cultures throughout their elementary years. Skill-building is also an on-going process. Students experience the creation process using clay, painting, sculpture, drawing, pastels, printmaking, and the fiber arts. Students will be able to understand and apply media/techniques/processes, use knowledge of structures and functions, choose and evaluate a range of subject matter/symbols/ideas, understand the visual arts in relation to history and cultures, reflect upon and assess characteristics and merits of their own work and the work of others, and make connections between the visual arts and other disciplines.

Teaching Spanish at Eastover is a spiraling process that allows children to revisit topics through the years in order to help with their language acquisition in a natural way. Children receive Spanish instruction twice a week for 60 minutes to 75 minutes total. The curriculum is aligned with the National Standards for Foreign Language Education and addresses the 5 Cs of foreign language education: communication, culture, comparisons, connections and communities.

The curriculum is delivered using the Natural Approach, which stresses the fact that comprehension comes before production and that the basis of the curriculum should consist of communicative goals which are by topic and not grammatical structure. Activities done in the classroom aimed at language acquisition must foster a lowering of the affective filter of students. The students must feel safe to make mistakes. (Stephen D. Krashen, 1983) Total Physical Response, music, and technology are also very important in teaching Spanish at Eastover.

The Physical Education program at Eastover has been designed to focus on lifelong activities intertwined with health related topics. Children need to enjoy being engaged in activity if they are to continue being active on a daily basis throughout their lifetime. Physical education classes are designed to build self-confidence around the concept of movement. The following is an overview of what physical education looks like for a student at Eastover Elementary. A K-4 student will experience locomotor skills, direction following, cooperative and team building activities, health lessons, hand-eye coordination activities, underhand and overhand throw, fitness concepts, jump rope, team and individual sports.

Education. The interrelated areas of singing, playing, reading, creating, listening, and making connections make a spiraled curriculum. It teaches the basic elements of music: rhythm, melody, form, harmony, and tone color.

At Eastover, music is taught and learned through a variety of philosophies including the Kodaly and the Orff-Schulwerk. Having an eclectic learning approach allows instruction to include active involvement of the child. This pedagogy directs learning by hearing and making music first, then reading and writing it later, or the same way we learned our native language. Speaking, singing, moving, listening, creating, reading, and playing percussion instruments are examples of basic materials used in music class. An emphasis is placed on folk games and song.

Besides the basic elements of music, many lifetime skills begin to develop in music classes. Among these skills are: appreciation of many different styles of music, understanding different cultures through music and dance, creating our own music and critical listening skills. Third and fourth grade students are given the opportunity to play in band or strings. They choose an instrument and are taught how to play that specific instrument.

Technology at Eastover is integrated into the elementary curriculum as a teaching and learning tool. Students experience and utilize technology individually and in a whole group setting. Each classroom has two or more computers, including a workstation that is connected to a Promethean board. Each week, all classes use the computer lab, which has 28 computers and an additional Promethean board that is attached to a teacher computer. In addition, all classes have access to a wireless mobile lab for classroom technology activities. Each classroom has a digital camera to capture teachable moments and a set of iPads (1:2) and a teacher's iPad.

#### 3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

A variety of instructional methods, approaches, and interventions are used to meet the diverse and individual needs of Eastover students to achieve instructional goals. A three-tiered approach to intervention is utilized at Eastover.

Tier 1 intervention is provided solely by the classroom teacher. It is designed to meet the needs of the majority of the students by using the Common Core standards, best practices, differentiated lessons, Visible Thinking routines, flexible grouping, ongoing assessments, and targeted-specific skills.

Tier 2 intervention is provided for students needing supplemental instruction in addition to classroom instruction and curriculum. It is designed to meet the needs of students by providing additional individual or small group instruction. This may include technology-based instruction to support and reinforce concepts introduced by the classroom teacher. Intervention programs may include Title I Leveled Literacy Intervention, Reading Recovery, Title I Math and Writing support, and General Education Resource Teacher (GERT) support and enrichment for the four core subject areas. Providers for this instruction may include the classroom teacher, Title I teachers, Reading Recovery specialists, General Education Resource Teacher (GERT), and support through the Building Instructional Team (BIT).

Tier 3 intervention is provided to a small percentage of students needing more explicit, specific, and intensive support. Interventions occur more frequently than Tier 1 and Tier 2, and the duration of the support is for a more extended period of time. An Individual Educational Plan (IEP) is created and followed for students receiving Tier 3 support. Intervention programs may include: Resource Room instruction, Academic Resource Program (ARP) instruction, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) instruction. These services may be provided by certified special education teachers, DHH teachers, social workers, psychologists, Speech and Language pathologists, Physical and Occupational therapists, and specialists from the intermediate school district (Oakland Intermediate School District).

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 11 of 25

Goals are developed in each tier to meet the specific academic needs of all students. Goals are taught through a variety of programs, methods, and manipulatives, focusing on student strengths, needs, and learning styles. Progress on these goals is monitored through observations, assessments (NWEA, DRA, District-wide assessments, classroom assessments) student work, teacher/parent conferences. Collaboration between classroom teachers, intervention specialists, and parents ensures high levels of student learning and achievement.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 12 of 25

#### PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

#### 1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

Overall, scores show improvement in all subjects over the last three years. Eastover scores were higher than the state and county average for our area. Eastover data shows that scores are increasing and gaps are starting to close.

3rd grade reading - There is an increase in scores in the last five years. However, there is still more than a 10% gap with all students as compared to African American students. Students are receiving parallel curriculum along the trend view.

#### 4th grade reading -

African Americans have increased from 47% up to 73% in the last couple of years, narrowing the gap with all students. This group is still below all students scoring 92%, therefore, there is more than a 10% gap. Although, economically disadvantaged students have jumped from around 40% up to around 67%, there is still a gap to close with all students.

While reflecting on our reading data, we reviewed our subgroup data and monitored our students with developmental reading assessments and running records to show progress. At Tier I, our staff is using the Common Core Units of Study and a Reading Workshop approach for all students. This enables them to differentiate reading for our students and provides small flexible grouping within the classroom. Our school provides Reading Recovery to students in first grade and Leveled Literacy Intervention support to our first and second grade students. For third and fourth grade students, Eastover provides general resource support.

#### 3rd grade math -

Although African American students have made significant improvements, there is still a gap compared to all students at 53% which is above state norm. Economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities are at 28% and 42% respectively. However, there is still a significant gap compared to student counterparts.

#### 4th grade math -

Over the last 5 years, economically disadvantaged students increased their academic performance from 17% up to 47%. Additionally, African American students' performance has improved up to 36.4% proficient, although an achievement gap remains.

The math data demonstrates, students were struggling with math facts, therefore affecting the application of math concepts to other areas. The staff made math fact fluency a school improvement goal. We also instituted a math workshop approach where teachers can differentiate lessons into small flexible groups to support children. We also have a Title I math intervention support program for all students that meet the entrance criteria. In addition, staff began using the Common Core Units of Study to increase math achievement and close the gap.

## 2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

Eastover Elementary addresses our students' assessments in a multitude of ways. By using a variety of formative and summative assessments, teachers use options and opportunities to assess students based on the Common Core State Standards. The results of these assessments drive our instruction to determine a process by which our students' needs are academically met.

Eastover uses a variety of assessments, such as Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA2), DIBELS, MLPP, and Bloomfield Hills District Common Assessment in Science and Social Studies, Bloomfield Hills Reading Inventory (BHRI), and Qualitative Reading Inventory.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 13 of 25

To align assessment and curriculum, teachers differentiate instruction with the students' learning goals, diverse interests, and experiences. At this point, students' depth of knowledge has increased which results in higher assessment scores. This method is used to measure academic growth throughout the school year and from year to year.

Teachers continuously collaborate, analyze, and create lesson plans in alignment with assessments to address specific concepts or skills. This data is used to obtain projected proficiency through strategies that focus on strengths and areas of concern. The assessments include: NWEA Grade Level math and reading reports to compare scores with national norms, DRA2 reading comprehension and fluency, DIBELS for phonemic awareness and alphabetic recognition, and District Assessments.

During the school year, parents receive curriculum and assessment communication via websites, newsletters, report cards, conferences, and resources based on students' overall performance.

As stakeholders, Eastover parents and teachers are members of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), and attend Coffee Talks with the principal. At these meetings, we analyze data by subgroups, discuss best practices, and select school curriculum goals based on CCSS. Trends of improvement, decline or gaps are discussed as well as plan for future improvement. We collaborate together to develop the best academic environment that maximizes our students' potential and creates a climate for global learners.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 14 of 25

#### 1. School Climate/Culture

Eastover is a special place that not only emphasizes academic growth, but also the emotional and social growth of all its community members. This sense of family begins the minute we walk in our school's doors and welcome each other with kind words and warm hugs. It is then followed by a day full of personal and public recognition of our students, parents, and staff in so many ways.

Our SOAR program (PBIS initiative) provides students and staff with the guidelines necessary to create an environment in which we embrace the philosophy of Self-control, On-task behavior, Acceptance, and Respect. It is through these beliefs, we are able to celebrate each person's unique contribution to our community.

In our school, one way in which we acknowledge our students positive actions academically, socially and emotionally throughout the day is through the use of Talon Tokens and SOAR cards. When a student receives a token or a SOAR card, the pride they display as they turn them into their classrooms or office is heartwarming. This is especially evident when a student who struggles with the everyday school routine is afforded the opportunity to experience success at school as well.

But this is just the beginning! Students get recognized again for their accomplishments at the end of the week and the end of the month. Weekly, our principal calls down students who have been chosen for privilege of the week. These students get to pick out prizes for a job well done. The excitement that ensues is contagious, even for the teachers, because one lucky teacher is awarded the Employee Parking Spot of the Week!

Wait, there is more! Then comes the arrival of the Eagle Cart at the end of each month which is sure to add a spark of excitement to the air. Students are given the chance to spend their Talon Tokens on a variety of prizes, or save up for the "Big Event" sponsored by the principal. Nobody leaves the school at the end of the day without a smile on their face and a sense of fulfillment.

For teachers, the rewards we receive are just as exciting! From getting our teacher lounge remodeled by our parents to the surprise snacks and treats delivered to us from our parents, principal and each other. Teacher appreciation week sponsored by the parents is one of the major highlights of our year. These special treats help us to to celebrate our accomplishments and share our mutual respect for each other. We also recognize each other at staff meetings by sharing celebrations with one another or by giving each other "Eagles." Teachers also share with each other at our Teacher Showcase during staff meeting time.

At Eastover, we cherish the time we spend together and it shows in everything we do from the minute we walk in the doors to the moment we leave.

#### 2. Engaging Families and Community

Eastover utilizes a number of strategies for parent and community involvement. These strategies include multiple opportunities throughout the year for families to be engaged in our school with through events and flexible meeting times. Each year we convene an annual meeting each fall to which all parents of students are invited and encouraged to attend about our school's participation in Title I. We involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely way in the planning, review and revising of our school's Title I program, curriculum night, conferences, school improvement plan, and overall school culture. Families are provided opportunities for regular meetings and surveys to formulate suggestions. The school improvement team regularly reviews the meeting notes, which are also available online, and responds to suggestions. Families and teachers work together to develop a School/Parent/Student Compact, which will continue to outline how each member will work together to ensure high student academic achievement.

NBRS 2015 15MI419PU Page 15 of 25

We also collaborate with community agencies; i.e., Community Mental Health. Eastover Elementary has worked with several local businesses and service providers in the community to foster student success and school improvement. We work with Chef James Rigato of The Root Restaurant in White Lake who does cooking demonstrations for students, staff, and parents to promote our healthy initiative which focuses on sustainable foods and eating local, seasonal produce. We partner with SOCRRA (South Oakland County Residential Recycling authority). Our first graders visit the facility where they are educated on the benefits of recycling and taught best practices for establishing life-long recycling habits. We partner with OCRA (Outdoor Classroom Resource Alliance), a non-profit organization that provides training and resources for staff and works with students on gardens and outdoor learning. SOCWA (Southeastern Oakland County Water Authority) provides training and resources for staff on composting and works with students and parents on a 2nd grade sustainability initiative promoting watershed preservation. Henry Ford Health System and Beaumont Hospital provide staff volunteers to serve as consultants and panelists for our Eat a Rainbow month initiative, which again promotes healthy food choices, sustainable food, and eating local/seasonal produce. Henry Ford Hospital in West Bloomfield provides resources and assistance with our Classroom Hydroponics program.

#### 3. Professional Development

Eastover's Elementary School's approach to professional development is that we use Professional Development days to train teachers in the areas of need, focused on school improvement. For example, this year we have had professional development in the areas of NWEA testing, Atlas Rubicon planning and input, Visible Thinking-Continuing the Journey, and new standards based report cards.

NWEA training focused on teachers learning to use the NWEA websites and Live Binders to look at areas of growth, need for enrichment, and remediation for each child. Teachers used the website to find a variety of reports to share with parents the current performance and expected growth of each student. These reports were shared at fall and spring conferences with parents.

Teachers were trained to use the Atlas Rubicon website for planning and documenting their lessons to meet the state standards. Teachers were given time to create and upload lessons on the Atlas Rubicon website. This allowed for teachers to work cooperatively within their grade level teams and works smarter, not harder. This template also provides teachers with a structure for implementing and documenting their teaching of and assessing the state standards.

The Visible Thinking leadership team attended training at the district level with the founder of Visible Thinking. The leadership team shared the information from the district meeting regarding moving from using the Visible Thinking routines to advancing this work into becoming a Culture of Thinkers.

The standards based report cards were new to Eastover therefore there were some glitches and challenges to work through. This professional development allowed for collaborative discussions with district and building staff. This allowed teachers to become more comfortable and confident in their reporting of student progress.

Finally, Eastover also took time to do data digs and analysis during professional development. This allowed teachers time and opportunities to look at their own classroom data as well as building data. Teachers reflected on the delivery of instruction and the performance of students' school wide as well as in specific sub-groups. These findings have our building looking at gaps in the progress of students specifically in gender in math (girls were scoring lower in math in 3rd grade and 4th grade boys in writing. We also identified needs in the area of Number and Operations abilities of 3rd graders. The performance gap in the area of ethnicity is showing improvement. These conclusions will assist improving achievement.

#### 4. School Leadership

Eastover's philosophy of leadership is a shared responsibility with school board members, administration, teachers, families and students. There are a number of meetings held throughout the year for each

stakeholder to give and receive feedback. There are also surveys conducted throughout the year. Eastover accepts input and provides feedback to all building and district teams. Everything we do is about ensuring student high levels of student achievement and fostering positive relationships. Listed below is a sample of our framework.

The principal serves as the main facilitator of meetings and also has the following responsibilities:

- establish a vision for the school and the school improvement plan through collaboration with all stakeholders
- ensure that all data are delivered to stakeholders in a timely manner
- establish agendas and provides minutes to team members and stakeholders
- communicate and plans for the involvement of families and community regarding school-wide goals and activities
- work with team members, coaches, district staff, consultants and families, to identify student and staff needs and advocate at a district level for resources, materials, and professional development

For example, the principal conducts Coffee Talks with families and staff each month, at flexible times, to review survey data and collect input or feedback about our school.

#### Committee Chairs:

- collaborate with the principal and other team members to set dates, times, locations, and agendas for school-wide meetings and communicates this information to team members and faculty
- support the development of the school leadership team action plan and addresses all needs of the school
- assist in data interpretation by linking data to school needs
- encourage contribution of all team members
- communicate all information (agendas, minutes, data review, and feedback) back to faculty to ensure two-way communication

For example, committee chairs meet with the staff to gather input and then coordinate with building administrator to plan out needs and professional development for the building.

Parents/Families that are team members on building committees:

- review agenda items prior to scheduled improvement/leadership team meetings
- regularly attend meetings, review data, and share ideas and input
- follow through on assigned tasks between meetings
- collect family or community input to bring to meetings
- bring necessary materials and adhere to norms
- ensure communication and opportunities for planning and involvement exist with families and community

For example, we have parents on our School Improvement Committee. These team members help us review our school-wide surveys, collect input from PTO and give us feedback on how we are doing at school improvement meetings. They also coordinate with the PTO to send surveys out from the school to gather as much input as possible.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| Subject: Math                                      | Test: MEAP                    |
|--|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 3                       | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: Michigan Educational Assessment Program |                               |

| School Year                      | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                    | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES*                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   | 53        | 61        | 51        | 60        | 53        |
| Advanced (Level 1)               | 16        | 9         | 4         | 4         | 3         |
| Number of students tested        | 74        | 99        | 77        | 82        | 95        |
| Percent of total students tested | 93        | 88        | 89        | 95        | 95        |
| Number of students tested with   |           | 13        |           |           |           |
| alternative assessment           |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with        | 7         | 12        | 11        | 5         | 5         |
| alternative assessment           |           |           |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Disadvantaged Students           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           | 28        | 38        | 31        |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested        |           | 18        | 16        | 16        |           |
| 2. Students receiving Special    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Education                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           | 43        |           | 62        | 42        |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           | 0         |           | 8         | 0         |
| Number of students tested        |           | 14        |           | 13        | 12        |
| 3. English Language Learner      |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested        |           |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           | <u> </u>  |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested        |           |           |           |           |           |
| 5. African- American             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                         | 27        | 12        | 1.5       | 1.5       | 12        |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   | 27        | 43        | 15        | 15        | 13        |
| Advanced (Level 1)               | 9         | 7         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested        | 11        | 14        | 13        | 13        | 15        |
| 6. Asian Students                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           | 1         |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           | 1         |
| Number of students tested        |           | 1         |           |           |           |

| School Year                    | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 7. American Indian or          |           |           |           |           |           |
| Alaska Native Students         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Pacific Islander Students      |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 9. White Students              |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 57        | 64        | 57        | 69        | 59        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 19        | 9         | 6         | 2         | 4         |
| Number of students tested      | 47        | 69        | 51        | 54        | 70        |
| 10. Two or More Races          |           |           |           |           |           |
| identified Students            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 11. Other 1: Female            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 50        | 56        | 56        | 61        | 46        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 18        | 9         | 4         | 0         | 2         |
| Number of students tested      | 38        | 54        | 27        | 51        | 41        |
| 12. Other 2: Male Students     |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 56        | 67        | 48        | 58        | 57        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 14        | 9         | 4         | 10        | 4         |
| Number of students tested      | 36        | 45        | 50        | 31        | 54        |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** NOTES: Students with alternate assessments took the MEAP-access or the Mi-access assessment during the five year span. See the table below. During the 13-14 school year one student did not take the MEAP assessment due to medical reasons.

School year default 2013-14 2012-13 2011-12 2010-11 2009-10

Mi - access

number of students 4 5 3 4 5

MEAP - access number of students 2 8 7 n/a n/a

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| Subject: Math                                      | Test: MEAP                    |
|--|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 4                       | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: Michigan Educational Assessment Program |                               |

| School Year                          | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                        | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES*                       | 300       |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 73        | 65        | 63        | 64        | 74        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 23        | 19        | 6         | 11        | 14        |
| Number of students tested            | 96        | 79        | 86        | 94        | 103       |
| Percent of total students tested     | 86        | 94        | 91        | 94        | 98        |
| Number of students tested with       | 16        |           |           |           |           |
| alternative assessment               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with            | 14        | 6         | 9         | 6         | 2         |
| alternative assessment               |           |           |           |           |           |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Disadvantaged Students               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 42        | 31        | 22        | 17        |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 17        | 23        | 0         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested            | 12        | 13        | 18        | 12        |           |
| 2. Students receiving Special        |           |           |           |           |           |
| Education                            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 63        | 62        | 67        | 56        | 75        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 11        | 15        | 20        | 6         | 6         |
| Number of students tested            | 19        | 13        | 15        | 18        | 16        |
| 3. English Language Learner Students |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |           |           |
| 5. African- American                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 36        | 33        | 25        | 21        | 24        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 9         | 8         | 0         | 0         | 6         |
| Number of students tested            | 11        | 12        | 16        | 14        | 17        |
| 6. Asian Students                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |           |           |
| 7. American Indian or                |           |           |           |           |           |
| Alaska Native Students               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year                    | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Pacific Islander Students      |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           | 91        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           | 19        |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           | 21        |
| 9. White Students              |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 77        | 74        | 67        | 69        | 81        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 20        | 23        | 2         | 8         | 14        |
| Number of students tested      | 69        | 53        | 55        | 67        | 63        |
| 10. Two or More Races          |           |           |           |           |           |
| identified Students            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 11. Other 1: Female            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 72        | 68        | 64        | 73        | 68        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 20        | 14        | 4         | 12        | 14        |
| Number of students tested      | 54        | 28        | 55        | 41        | 57        |
| 12. Other 2: Male Students     |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 74        | 63        | 62        | 57        | 80        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 26        | 22        | 9         | 9         | 13        |
| Number of students tested      | 42        | 51        | 34        | 53        | 46        |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** Students with alternate assessments took the MEAP-access or the Mi-access assessment during the five year span. During the 13-14 school year 1 student did not take the state assessment due to medical reasons.

School year default 2013-14 2012-13 2011-12 2010-11 2009-10 Mi - access number of students 6 2 2 6 2 MEAP - access number of students 10 3 7 N/A N/A

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| Subject: Reading/ELA                               | Test: MEAP                    |
|--|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 3                       | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: Michigan Educational Assessment Program |                               |

| School Year                      | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010     |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Testing month                    | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct           |
| SCHOOL SCORES*                   |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   | 81        | 91        | 87        | 78        | 80            |
| Advanced (Level 1)               | 18        | 21        | 13        | 13        | 15            |
| Number of students tested        | 72        | 96        | 78        | 83        | 95            |
| Percent of total students tested | 90        | 86        | 89        | 95        | 95            |
| Number of students tested with   |           | 15        |           |           |               |
| alternative assessment           |           |           |           |           |               |
| % of students tested with        | 10        | 14        | 11        | 5         | 5             |
| alternative assessment           |           |           |           |           |               |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                  |           |           |           |           |               |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price        |           |           |           |           |               |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/            |           |           |           |           |               |
| Disadvantaged Students           |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           | 71        | 81        | 75        |               |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           | 6         | 6         | 0         |               |
| Number of students tested        |           | 17        | 16        | 16        |               |
| 2. Students receiving Special    |           |           |           |           |               |
| Education                        |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           | 83        |           | 71        | 75            |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           | 17        |           | 14        | 25            |
| Number of students tested        |           | 12        |           | 14        | 12            |
| 3. English Language Learner      |           |           |           |           |               |
| Students                         |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           |               |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           |               |
| Number of students tested        |           |           |           |           |               |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino            |           |           |           |           |               |
| Students                         |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           |               |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           |               |
| Number of students tested        |           |           |           |           |               |
| 5. African- American             |           |           |           |           |               |
| Students                         |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   | 64        | 77        | 77        | 69        | 47            |
| Advanced (Level 1)               | 9         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Number of students tested        | 11        | 13        | 13        | 13        | 15            |
| 6. Asian Students                |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           |               |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           |               |
| Number of students tested        |           |           |           |           |               |
| 7. American Indian or            |           |           |           |           |               |
| Alaska Native Students           |           |           |           |           |               |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above   |           |           |           |           |               |
| Advanced (Level 1)               |           |           |           |           | Page 22 of 25 |

| School Year                    | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Pacific Islander Students      |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 9. White Students              |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 85        | 91        | 89        | 75        | 89        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 22        | 24        | 15        | 15        | 19        |
| Number of students tested      | 46        | 67        | 53        | 55        | 70        |
| 10. Two or More Races          |           |           |           |           |           |
| identified Students            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 11. Other 1: Female            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 81        | 91        | 90        | 83        | 83        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 24        | 23        | 17        | 15        | 24        |
| Number of students tested      | 37        | 53        | 30        | 52        | 41        |
| 12. Other 2: Male Students     |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 80        | 91        | 85        | 71        | 78        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 11        | 19        | 10        | 10        | 7         |
| Number of students tested      | 35        | 43        | 48        | 31        | 54        |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** NOTES: Students with alternate assessments took the MEAP-access or the Mi-access assessment during the five year span. See the table below.

School year default 2013-14 2012-13 2011-12 2010-11 2009-10 Mi - access number of students 4 6 5 4 5

MEAP - access number of students 4 9 5 N/A N/A

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| Subject: Reading/ELA                               | Test: MEAP                    |
|--|-------------------------------|
| All Students Tested/Grade: 4                       | Edition/Publication Year: N/A |
| Publisher: Michigan Educational Assessment Program |                               |

| School Year                          | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011  | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|
| Testing month                        | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct  | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES*                       | Oct       | Oct       | OCI       | OCI  | OCI       |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 92        | 83        | 85        | 79   | 84        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 9         | 7         | 14        | 11   | 22        |
| Number of students tested            | 94        | 76        | 91        | 94   | 103       |
| Percent of total students tested     | 85        | 89        | 93        | 94   | 98        |
| Number of students tested with       | 17        | 07        | 73        | ) <del>)                                  </del> | 70        |
| alternative assessment               | 17        |           |           |  |           |
| % of students tested with            | 15        | 11        | 7         | 6  | 2         |
| alternative assessment               |           |           | ,         |  | 1         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                      |           |           |           |  |           |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price            |           |           |           |  |           |
| Meals/Socio-Economic/                |           |           |           |  |           |
| Disadvantaged Students               |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 67        | 69        | 53        | 42   |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 0         | 8         | 0         | 0  |           |
| Number of students tested            | 12        | 13        | 19        | 12   |           |
| 2. Students receiving Special        |           |           |           |  |           |
| Education                            |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 88        | 70        | 82        | 56   | 69        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 0         | 10        | 18        | 11   | 6         |
| Number of students tested            | 17        | 10        | 17        | 18   | 16        |
| 3. English Language Learner Students |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |  |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |  |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |  |           |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino                |           |           |           |  |           |
| Students                             |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |  |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |  |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |  |           |
| 5. African- American                 |           |           |           |  |           |
| Students                             |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       | 73        | 58        | 47        | 50   | 53        |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | 9         | 8         | 0         | 7  | 6         |
| Number of students tested            | 11        | 12        | 17        | 14   | 17        |
| 6. Asian Students                    |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |  |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   |           |           |           |  |           |
| Number of students tested            |           |           |           |  |           |
| 7. American Indian or                |           |           |           |  |           |
| Alaska Native Students               |           |           |           |  |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above       |           |           |           |  | <u> </u>  |
| Advanced (Level 1)                   | <u> </u>  |           |           |  |           |

| School Year                    | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Pacific Islander Students      |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           | 86        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           | 24        |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           | 21        |
| 9. White Students              |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 93        | 86        | 91        | 85        | 91        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 7         | 8         | 18        | 9         | 27        |
| Number of students tested      | 67        | 51        | 56        | 67        | 63        |
| 10. Two or More Races          |           |           |           |           |           |
| identified Students            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |
| 11. Other 1: Female            |           |           |           |           |           |
| Students                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 93        | 93        | 88        | 88        | 86        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 11        | 14        | 20        | 17        | 23        |
| Number of students tested      | 55        | 28        | 56        | 41        | 57        |
| 12. Other 2: Male Students     |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above | 90        | 77        | 80        | 72        | 80        |
| Advanced (Level 1)             | 5         | 2         | 6         | 6         | 22        |
| Number of students tested      | 39        | 48        | 35        | 53        | 46        |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient (Level 2) and above |           |           |           |           |           |
| Advanced (Level 1)             |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested      |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** NOTES: Students with alternate assessments took the MEAP-access or the Mi-access assessment during the five year span. See the table below. During the 13-14 school year one student did not take the MEAP assessment due to medical reasons.

School year default 2013-14 2012-13 2011-12 2010-11 2009-10 Mi - access number of students 6 2 2 6 2 MEAP - access number of students 10 3 7 N/A N/A